IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

TUESDAY, THE 9TH OCTOBER 2007 / 17TH ASWINA 1929

WP(C).No. 27258 of 2007(T)

PETITIONER:

RAJEEVAN, S/O. KANARAN,
KULANGARATH HOUSE, CHERAPURAM P.O.,
KAKKATTIL, VATAKARA.

BY ADV. SRI.C.R.SIVAKUMAR

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. THE STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY, THE MOTOR VEHICLE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE SECRETARY,
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICE, VATAKARA.

3. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICE, VATAKARA.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BENJAMIN PAUL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 09/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WPC NO.27258/07

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTERED CERTIFICATE OF KL-11/L-6294.

EXT.P2: THE PERMIT ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.P3: THE TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DT.21/8/06.

EXT.P4: TRUE COPY OF THE ORER DT/31/8/06

EXT.P5: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DT.27/12/06.

EXT.P6: TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DT.31/8/07.

EXT.P7: TRUE COPY OF THE FRESH APPLICATION DT.10/9/07.

//TRUE COPY//

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.
==========
W.P.(C) NO. 27258 OF 2007 T
==========

Dated this the 9th day of October, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The grievance of the petitioner is that final order pursuant to Ext.P5 has not been passed by the 2nd respondent.

2. Learned Government Pleader on instructions submits that the delay involved was on account of non receipt of records from the STAT, which rendered Ext.P5 judgment.

3. In view of Ext.P5 judgment of the Tribunal, the 2nd respondent is obliged to pass orders. If for passing orders as directed, records to be called for, that should be done.

4. Orders pursuant to Exhibits P3 and P7 applications shall be passed as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of eight weeks of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment before the 2nd respondent for compliance.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.

Rp